UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,141	12/05/2001	Alexander Beeck	033275-316	3862
Robert S. Swec	7590 03/08/201 ker	EXAMINER		
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			WIEHE, NATHANIEL EDWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		3745		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/002,141	BEECK ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
NATHANIEL WIEHE	3745	

	NATHANIEL WIEHE	3745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 February 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice eplies: (1) an amendment, affic al (with appeal fee) in compliar	of Appeal. To avoid abar lavit, or other evidence, w ace with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set fo ter than SIX MONTHS from the ma b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN	alling date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sleet forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amo nortened statutory period for reply o	unt of the fee. The appropria originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	sideration and/or search (see f v);	NOTE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11	orresponding number of finally 6 and 41.33(a)).	rejected claims.	
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed the proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed to the proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed to the proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed to the proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed to the proposed or amended to the pro		·	ŕ
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	•	·	-
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 3.16.22-29.34 and 35. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		N. C.A. I. III.	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under ap	peal and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	_	
	/Nathan Wiehe/ Primary Examiner, Al	t Unit 3745	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly presneted limitation of claim 23 wherein the entirerly of the second wall is not connected to the second portion of the third wall had not been previously presented and would require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the uninterrupted limitation, while Semmler does include radial discharge passages and ribs at least the central/lower area of the passage is unobstructed along its length. Further, it is unclear the extent to which Applicant has support for such a limitation as it appears that the limitation is truly meant to be negative in nature and specifically exclude the presence of discharge passages and ribs. However, these elements are not necessarily interruptions given the meaning of such a term to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, Applicant's specification fails to provide any special definition for the term 'uninterrupted'.

Regarding the perpendicular limitation, Applicant annotates a drawing and then indicates that the angle of Semmler is 122° and thus no substantially perpendicular. The examiner respectfully disagrees. While not commenting on the appropriateness or adequately of taking exact measurements from the figure of a patent document, the examiner notes that the angle shown in Applicant's annotations is not, in fact, 122°. Without taking the position that the annotating drawing represents an accurate measurement of the perpendicular nature of Semmler's second passage, the examiner notes that a measurement of said annotated drawing by means of a protractor indicates that the angle is about 110°. Again, this is not an indication by the examiner of the actual angle and the examiner maintains the rationale articulated in the prior office action that Semmler's second passage is substantially perpendicular and thus meets the claim limitation.